



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/569,827	02/28/2006	Jack Gin	ETVpDSC	5395
7590		04/02/2009	EXAMINER	
Paul D. Gornall Barrister & Solicitor 1820-355 Burrard St. Vancouver, BC V6C2G8 CANADA			CHEN, CHIA WEI A	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2622		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/02/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/569,827	Applicant(s) GIN ET AL.
	Examiner CHIA-WEI A. CHEN	Art Unit 2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 February 2006.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-11,13 and 14 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 12 and 15 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 28 February 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/06)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 13 is objected to because of the following informalities:

The sentence of Claim 13 ends with a semicolon instead of a period.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riconda (US 2002/0130953).

Claim 1, Riconda teaches in Fig. 9, a camera system comprising:

a camera (camera element 930) adapted for recording images under a first type of illumination;

a first illuminator (illumination sources 921-924) for providing the first type of illumination;

and wherein illumination and camera compartments are separated from each other by an opaque wall preventing light from the illuminator originating in the second compartment from reflecting off the second translucent pane directly to the camera and preventing light (See Fig. 11A, paragraph 0090-0091: each

Art Unit: 2622

lens-illuminator subsystem, or "lightguide", is designed so that the light of the illuminator is directed in a manner surrounding the lens, but away from the translucent viewing pane in front of the lens; this is accomplished by applying a coating to the sides of the lightguide. The coating prevents light from leaking out of the lightguide, and thus also from reflecting off the translucent viewing pane of the lens. As shown in Fig. 9B, a camera is surrounded by a number of separate lens-illuminators, which can illuminate the scene to be viewed by the camera in any of a number of selected types of illumination.);

but Riconda does not expressly teach:

a second camera adapted for recording images under a second type of illumination;

a second illuminator for providing the second type of illumination;

a first compartment having a first translucent viewing pane and containing the first camera and the second illuminator;

f) a second compartment having a second translucent viewing pane and containing the second camera and the first illuminator.

Although Riconda does not expressly teach a second camera in a compartment separated from the first camera by an opaque wall, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to have considered the use of two cameras illuminated by two different illumination sources where the camera(s) are shielded from the illumination sources in each case. This allows a

more compact construction of the multi-spectral illumination imaging system described in paragraph 0121 of Riconda.

Claim 2, Riconda teaches wherein different illumination sources are used depending on which type of illumination provides the best recorded image via its respective camera in ambient conditions for the system from time to time (Different illuminators are used depending on ambient conditions: infrared can be used at nighttime to detect heat sources, ultraviolet light can cut through haze or fog, etc. See paragraphs 0083-0087; also see paragraph 0121). It would have been obvious to apply this system to a system having a second camera for the rationale described in claim 1.

Claim 3, Riconda teaches wherein illuminators can provide different kinds of illumination, including visible and infrared light (paragraph 0121). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to have used two illuminators and cameras for the rationale described in claim 1.

Claim 8, Riconda teaches wherein a colour camera has a lens optimized for colour viewing, with infra-red filtering (visible spectrum camera sensitive to visible light, along with appropriate filter; paragraph 0121).

Art Unit: 2622

Claim 9, Riconda teaches wherein a monochrome camera has a lens optimized for monochrome viewing, with visible light filtering (infrared camera sensitive to infrared light, along with appropriate filter; paragraph 0121).

Claim 10, Riconda teaches wherein the monochrome camera is supercharged electronically for infrared sensitivity (The monochrome camera may be an camera sensitive to infrared illumination; paragraph 0121).

Claim 11, Riconda teaches an infrared illuminator that gives illumination in the infrared range (paragraph 0121). Although Riconda does not specifically teach wherein the illumination is of from 805 to 995 nanometers of electromagnetic radiation, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to have recognized that 805-995 nanometers is the range of wavelengths corresponding to infrared light.

4. Claims 4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riconda in view of Bauer (US 6,550,949).

Claim 4, Riconda teaches the surveillance camera system of claim 1, but does not expressly teach wherein the first and second compartments are formed by a box with a dividing wall.

Art Unit: 2622

Bauer teaches the use of miniaturized compartments for the system components. In Figs. 12-14 of Bauer, groups of colored LEDs are shown, separated by baffles (380) from each other, and from the imaging camera (26a).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the baffles of Bauer with the camera system of Riconda to prevent different stray lighting sources from interfering with each other and the camera (See col. 15, lines 31-35 of Riconda).

Claim 7, Bauer teaches a camera system in which the compartments are miniaturized to fit within standard electrical switch box dimensions in order to be adapted to be hidden behind a translucent decor switch plate (Bauer teaches a miniaturized illumination and camera system that fits in a housing mounted in the tail light assembly of a vehicle; col. 15, lines 4-8).

Art Unit: 2622

5. Claims 5, 6, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riconda in view of Sarajii (US 6,179,434).

Claim 5, Riconda teaches the dual surveillance camera system of claim 1, but does not expressly teach wherein the first and second compartments have cooling fins formed of a heat-conducting material.

The heat sink described in claim 5 is a well known means of carrying off heat from lighting systems.

Sarajii teaches conductive end caps attached to a lighting housing that uses the attached cabinet as a heat sink, drawing heat away from shelving containing products which may otherwise be negatively affected by the heat. This is analogous to using the present surveillance cabinet as a heat sink to draw heat away from the cameras contained within.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the cooling mechanism of Sarajii with the camera system of Riconda to draw heat that could affect the sensitivity of an imaging element, away from the cameras.

Art Unit: 2622

Claim 6, Sarajii teaches wherein a lighting system is contained in a box that contains components to draw heat away from the contents of the box. See rationale of claim 5.

Claim 13, is the combination of a camera system described in claim 1, rejected by Riconda, and a box that is a heat sink with cooling fins formed of a heat-conducting material, rejected by Sarajii in claims 5 and 6 above.

Claim 14, Riconda teaches a camera system which the compartments are miniaturized to fit within standard electrical switch box dimensions in order to be adapted to be hidden behind a translucent decor switch plate (Riconda teaches in Fig. 7 wherein a camera system is miniaturized to fit within the space of a side mirror of a motorized vehicle.) It would have been obvious to apply the cooling mechanism of Sarajii to a system having a second camera for the rationale described in claim 5.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 12 and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHIA-WEI A. CHEN whose telephone

Art Unit: 2622

number is (571)270-1707. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:30 - 17:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lin Ye can be reached on (571) 272-7372. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tuan V Ho/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2622

/C. A. C./
Examiner, Art Unit 2622